DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 418 EC 304 812

AUTHOR Downing, June E.; And Others
TITLE The Process of Including Elementary Students with Autism and Intellectual Impairments in Their Typical Classrooms.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (74th, Orlando, FL, April 1-5, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Attitude Change; *Autism; Behavior Disorders; Case Studies; Classroom Observation Techniques; Elementary Education; *Inclusive Schools; *Interpersonal Competence; *Mental Retardation; Multiple Disabilities; Outcomes of Education; Parent Attitudes; Peer Relationship; Qualitative Research; Self Control; Severe Disabilities; Social Integration; Student Educational Objectives; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A qualitative case study methodology was used to examine the process of including three students with autism, intellectual impairments, and behavioral challenges in age-appropriate typical classrooms and home schools. Data were obtained over a 9-month period from field notes of a participant researcher and three paraeducators, structured observations, samples of student work, and pre/post interviews with 17 key individuals. Findings describe a process requiring ongoing modifications and adjustments to meet individual needs and expectations. All three students demonstrated considerable progress in the areas of social interactions with peers, increased self-control, and ability to follow class rules and directions, as well as academic skill development. However, by the end of the year all three students still required considerable support, were not performing on grade level, and were still having difficulty socially interacting and controlling their inappropriate behavior. Adult reactions were mixed. Although seven adults stated they were neutral about inclusion at the beginning of the project, only two reported this position in May. However, the number of people indicating a negative view of inclusion increased from one to three. The number of respondents who believed that a major benefit of inclusion was teaching nondisabled students to appreciate differences increased from 8 to 14. Interview questions and a classroom observation form are appended. (Contains 28 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 395 418

Inclusion 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Process of Including Elementary Students with Autism and Intellectual Impairments in Their Typical Classrooms

June E. Downing
California State University, Northridge

Andrea Morrison
University of Arizona

Maria A. Berecin-Rascon
Casa Grande Elementary Schools, Casa Grande, Arizona

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Downing
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EC304812

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The study used a case study methodology to investigate the process involved in returning three elementary students with autism, intellectual impairments, and challenging behaviors to their home schools and age-appropriate general education classrooms. Data were obtained from field notes from a participant researcher and three paraeducators, structured observations, samples of student work and pre/post interviews with key players. This nine month study of one school year documented the steps in the process for three students with autism in their home school, typical classrooms and reported the results of those actions on student behavior. While all three students demonstrated considerable progress during the school year, the outcomes were varied. Adult perceptions, both before and after experiencing inclusion for a year are discussed and compared across the three students. While attitudes toward inclusion were generally positive, different aspects of the process and characteristics of the students involved lead to unique perceptions and reactions to the process. This study supports research findings on the importance of attitudes toward inclusion in making the process successful and that individual characteristics of students and key players have a differential impact on the success of inclusive practices.

The Process of Including Elementary Students with Autism and Intellectual Impairments in Their Typical Classrooms

Educating students with severe disabilities in typical classrooms with their nondisabled peers, has gained increasing recognition and support (Hamre-Nietupski, McDonald & Nietupski, 1992; Salisbury, Palombaro & Hollowood, 1993; Stainback & Stainback, 1992). The benefits of this trend have been clearly articulated and verified in several research studies for the student with severe disabilities (Kennedy & Itkonen, 1994; Ryndak, Downing, Jacqueline & Morrison, in press; Staub & Hunt, 1993), their nondisabled classmates (Giangreco, Edelman, Cloninger & Dennis, 1992; Peck, Donaldson & Pezzoli, 1990; Vacc & Cannon, 1991; York, Vandercook, McDonald, Heise-Neff & Caughey, 1992), and teachers (Giangreco, Dennis, Cloninger, Edelman & Schattman, 1993). Benefits for students with severe disabilities who also have behavioral disorders include appropriate role models, responsive communication partners and a sense of belonging. Yet students with behavior disorders often are denied access to general education classrooms due to their aggressive, self-injurious, destructive and in general, disruptive behavior (Janney & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Evans, 1986). In fact placement in a typical classroom may be contingent upon the display of appropriate behavior.

Students with autism, especially when a cognitive impairment is also present, frequently display the types of behavior that make inclusion challenging. These students often are impulsive, resistant to change, exhibit destructive and/or aggressive behavior to themselves or others and communicate their frustration by screaming, throwing objects,

running away, etc. (Simpson & Zionts, 1992; Woods, 1982). Due to these behaviors and the educational benefits for these students of a highly structured environment, inclusion in typical classrooms has not been as strongly advocated (Simpson & Zionts, 1992; Wolf-Schein, 1994). As a result little information is available specifically addressing this group of students in fully inclusive settings. However, the benefits of inclusion for these students merit attention, especially since self-contained environments are not conducive to the development of language and social interaction skills (Peck, 1985).

Though few students with severe autism have been fully included in typical classrooms, researchers have found that these children do benefit from time spent with nondisabled peers. Lanquetot (1989) studied the impact of peers on the behavior of young children (ages 3 1/2 -7) with autism. Her study, which used both a control and experimental group, clearly showed that the students who spent time with peer models not only improved in task completion (naming letters), but also showed immediate improvement in cooperation, and reduced angry and aggressive behavior. Odom and Strain (1986) studied the interaction of preschoolers with autism and found that social initiations made by nondisabled peers increased the responses of the children with autism. Lord and Hopkins (1986) demonstrated that even without specific training nondisabled peers were able to modify their interactions to include children with autism, which had a positive impact on those children. Finally, McGee, Paradis & Feldman (1993) demonstrated that merely the physical presence of nondisabled peers (with no specific training on interaction) had a positive effect on reducing what was defined as autistic behaviors in preschool children.

Although students with autism and other students with similar behavioral issues clearly benefit from interactions with their nondisabled peers, they also present a unique challenge to the educational system. Considerable information is needed to aid in the process of placing these children full time in typical environments. In addition, the impact of an inclusive educational program on the student with autism needs to be more closely examined. The purpose of this study was to investigate the process of educating elementary aged children with challenging behaviors in their home school and age-appropriate typical classrooms. A case study methodology was undertaken in an attempt to provide an in-depth description of the strategies used to provide an effective typical learning environment for three young boys with autism and intellectual impairments, and the resulting impact on their in-class performance. This type of methodology allows for a more encompassing description of the inclusion process. The process of inclusion is described for the entire school year for the three students. Implications for similar efforts toward developing inclusive educational programs for similar students will be discussed.

Method

Students/Settings

This study took place in a rural school district with approximately 4,500 students, of which the majority of students were Hispanic and approximately 44 percent were white. The district had seven elementary schools and one junior high school. The selection of this site was determined by the fact that the district was moving toward a fully inclusive educational system for all students. Of particular interest was the district's immediate plan to fully include three students with autism in their home school, regular education classrooms. Two

of the students were Hispanic and one was Caucasian. The socioeconomic status of the students fell in the middle and lower categories.

Student #1. At the time of the study, Jose was a five year old boy identified as autistic with cognitive impairments in the moderate range. Jose used unintelligible vocalizations, pointing, moving toward objects and people to communicate. Jose had difficulty staying with any activity for any length of time. Instead he would run around the classroom, and leave the work area and classroom when he chose. When redirected he would bite, kick, run away or tantrum (throw himself to the floor, cry and engage in loud vocalizations). He would stay on task for brief periods of time (less than one minute) and avoid interactions with others. He refused to engage in any "academic" work, in fact he showed very little understanding of academic demands. He seemed unable to follow one step commands. He refused to color or hold a pencil. However, he could put 5-10 piece puzzles together and could match object to object. Jose had no physical or sensory disabilities and was not on any medications for his behaviors.

At the beginning of the school year Jose was placed in a morning kindergarten classroom in his home school with 19 children and a kindergarten teacher. Jose also had assigned to him a full time paraeducator for his daily 2.5 hours in kindergarten. In addition a special educator (inclusion support teacher) was responsible for seeing that his educational program was implemented. This teacher spent approximately eight hours a week with Jose in direct instruction. Jose received both speech and occupational therapy on a consultative basis.

Student #2. Santos was seven at the time of the study and was identified as having autism with cognitive delays in the moderate to severe range. He lived in a monolingual Spanish home and was nonverbal and communicated by looking, moving toward and manipulating objects and people. He communicated his frustration, anger, boredom and refusal by screaming, throwing objects, running away, and engaging in tantrum behavior (falling to the floor, crying). Santos' prior educational placement had been in a room with one other adult and focused on free play and sensory activities. He maintained time on task for approximately one minute on nonpreferred tasks (academic) and for hours on preferred activities (solitary water play, sand play) if uninterrupted. Academically Santos matched object to object and requested objects by manipulating the person. He could replicate lines with a pencil following a model. Santos had no physical disabilities and was very active. He also had no sensory impairments, though he did have frequent ear infections. He received no medication for his behaviors.

At the start of the study, Santos was placed in his home school in a first grade classroom with one teacher and 22 classmates. Santos also had a Spanish speaking full-time paraeducator for his six hour school day. The inclusion support teacher was responsible for ensuring that his educational program was implemented and she provided direct instruction for eight hours a week. Occupational therapy was provided on a consultative basis.

Student #3. At the time of the study, Troy was eight years old and identified as having mild mental retardation with sensory deficits and autistic-like behaviors. Troy communicated verbally, though primarily to adults and not his classmates. At times Troy engaged in behaviors such as rolling on the floor, screaming, soiling and urinating in his

pants and laughing in a repetitive manner. Troy had no physical disabilities and received no medication to control his behaviors. Troy had been placed in a typical kindergarten and first grade, but had received little support from a special educator trained in the area of severe disabilities. At the onset of this study Troy's academic skills consisted of recognizing some letters, his name and a few corresponding sounds, counting to ten, and writing a few recognizable letters and his name.

Troy was placed in a second grade classroom in his home school with 24 other students and his second grade teacher. He also had a paraeducator assigned to him for his six hour school day. The inclusion support teacher was responsible for ensuring that his educational program was implemented and provided eight hours a week in direct instruction. Troy also received consultative occupational therapy and pull-out speech therapy.

Procedure

The procedure used in the investigation of this study involved semi-structured interviews with key players, field notes by an active participant researcher, field notes by other participants (paraeducators), structured observations by the researchers, notes from staff meetings, and analysis of student work. These data sources were used to compare and confirm information obtained via methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1978).

Interviews. At the beginning of the school year in August all key players for each of the three students were interviewed by a doctoral student in special education with an emphasis in severe disabilities to determine attitudes and beliefs about inclusion (see Appendix A for interview questions). For the purpose of this study, full inclusion was defined as full time placement in gneeral education (same age), no pull out or minimal pull-

out (one hour or less per day), actively involved in learning with other children to meet individual needs (not necessarily grade level academics), and treated like an equal member of the class. For each student the following individuals were interviewed: mother, classroom teacher, special educator (inclusion support teacher), paraeducator, and principal. For two of the students (Santos and Troy) their physical education (P.E.) teachers were also interviewed. Jose did not have physical education as he was in kindergarten. These same people were interviewed by the same doctoral student at the end of the year in May to determine if a year experiencing full inclusion impacted their responses. When new key players entered the picture (e.g., a new principal was hired mid year), this person was interviewed as soon as possible and again interviewed at the end of the school year.

The interviews consisted of both closed-ended and open-ended questions that asked key players to state their view of inclusion, and if they felt there were any benefits, concerns, needs for support or special teaching strategies, and hopes and fears for the future. Questions for the interviews were originally taken from interview questions developed for a related study (see Downing, Eichinger & Jacqueline, in preparation). These questions were then adapted by the first two authors to meet the particular needs of the present study. Interviews lasted between 20 and 45 minutes and were all done by the doctoral student in special education, who audiotaped and also transcribed each interview. All the interviews followed an interview guide so as to elicit responses to similar questions for each interviewee. Interviews occurred at a place and time convenient for each key player and an interpreter was employed for the parent who spoke only Spanish.

Field Notes. Field notes consisted of entries made by each paraeducator (daily) and inclusion support teacher (per visit) in independent logs or journals. These entries were intended to enhance communication between paraeducators and inclusion support teacher and included information on student performance, challenging behaviors, reactions from others (classroom teacher, classmates), strategies used and their success or failure, recommendations for further student participation and also comments by other staff and family members. Copies of all staff meetings on each student were gathered to obtain information on team perceptions of the process, student program difficulties, suggested solutions, and action plans.

Observations. Structured observations, by the researchers and special education staff were made periodically during the year, to record student performance, challenging behaviors, time student spent with other students, interaction of classroom teacher to the target student and reactions of others (e.g., teacher and classmates) to the student (see Appendix B for observation form). These were narrative descriptions of what was observed, and served as checks on information recorded in the daily and weekly logs. The number of observations for the entire school year were as follows: Jose, 31, Santos, 30 and Troy, 18 with each observation lasting approximately one hour. Reliability checks occurred for observations when both a researcher and one special education staff member recorded data for the same activity. These checks indicated 100% agreement and occurred for the following percentage of observations per student, Jose, 16%, Santos, 13%, and Troy, 22%. The range in number of observations was due to absences experienced by the students as well as a late start date for Troy who was on vacation.

Data Analysis

Interviews. The three authors extracted data from each interview in the form of individual comments according to the predetermined areas of questioning. Similar comments were grouped and tallied. These statements and frequency counts were then verified by a second author and comparisons were made across individual respondents and from the beginning of the year to the end of the school year. Discrepancies were resolved through group discussion and by returning to the transcribed interviews.

Field notes and Observation. Data from paraeducators' daily logs, staff meetings, inclusion support teachers' weekly log, and researchers' periodic observations were compiled per student, ordered chronologically and condensed by the authors into the individual case studies. Student work (e g., Troy's spelling words or math sheets, or Santos' tracing) was used to verify reported observations of student progress. These case studies were checked by the inclusion support teacher who verified the observations, corrected errors and clarified certain observations by adding information. At this point the case studies were read by one teacher, two paraeducators and two parents (all of whom volunteered to give feedback) to serve as member checks to verify that the researchers' analysis accurately reflected the process. All feedback from these individuals were incorporated into the final document.

Findings

Though each student progressed differently with unique support strategies, certain commonalties in the process emerged for all three boys. Within the first two weeks of school a Choosing Options and Accommodations for Children (COACH) assessment (see Giangreco, Cloniger, & Iverson, 1993) was done for each boy by the inclusion support teacher and the

child's mother and then reviewed by related service staff. Priorities identified via COACH served to indicate the activities requiring a functional analysis to determine expected/desired skills and individual discrepancies. This assessment process in turn served to guide the IEP development. The inclusion support teacher and all three paraeducators met weekly for 45-60 minutes to plan for the students. Topics discussed during these meetings included training needs, data collection, curricular adaptations, facilitating interactions with peers, instructional techniques, especially for behavioral issues, and general frustrations. To help staff keep positive about the process all meetings ended on at least one positive observation per student. It was during one of these meetings that this team decided not to have the paraeducators rotate from student to student every four weeks, since after one rotation it was perceived as too disruptive for teachers and students alike. In addition to the weekly meetings, the inclusion support teacher also conducted monthly paraeducator training for all paraeducators in the district. The training covered ways to support students in general education classrooms including the philosophy of inclusion, behavioral issues, and adaptations.

Team meetings, which included the classroom teacher, the inclusion support teacher, paraeducators, and occasionally the parents, also occurred weekly at the onset of the project and then became dependent on the classroom teacher's need to meet. Team meetings discussed grading concerns, behavioral issues (e.g., how to keep the student in the classroom) and necessary curriculum adaptations. As a result of these meetings, a daily schedule was made for each student to use as were specific adaptations (e.g., modified worksheets, choice of implements to use). All adaptations were individualized to reflect

student interests. Specific behavioral procedures were implemented per student. Observations for individual students follow.

Student 1. Jose

August/September. At the beginning of the school year, Jose's classroom teacher, paraeducator, inclusion support teacher, and the principal all reported feeling very positive with regards to inclusion and felt that Jose should be attending his home school. Only his mother was less positive, recognizing that her son would have difficult days and that though she liked the idea of her son attending the home school, she wondered if another school with a special program for children with autism might not be better.

August and September were difficult months for Jose and were characterized by his wandering around the classroom, staying away from the group, running away when demands were placed on him, biting the paraeducator and teacher, playing chase games with staff, leaving the room, hitting other students and having a number of temper tantrums involving crying, screaming and kicking. When he left the classroom, went outside and refused to return, he was physically returned by support staff. The classroom teacher expressed being unsure of what to do and felt inadequately trained. In the pre-interview she said she was glad they would be meeting daily if needed.

On a more positive note, the use of the pictorial schedule seemed to help with transitions from one activity to the next. On September 20 his mother noticed that he was more verbal at home and better behaved. He wrote the first two letters of his first name on September 27 and his classroom teacher noticed that he was doing better-- involved with the class more, following group directions and playing with peers at recess.

During September the team decided to divide his day into 30 minute segments, developed a more structured schedule and were trying to keep him within a five foot radius of the group (even if he wasn't exactly with the group). They had decided to avoid coloring (which he disliked) and used paints instead. They also decided that it would be more effective to use their bodies to block exits versus chasing him.

October/November. During October Jose spent much more time with the class (e.g., 35 min. one day and 71 min. another) and was following directions. He liked to move with the group for their music time, but still stayed at a distance for seat work.

The team agreed that carrying him back into the room when he ran out was the strategy to use, but only after they had given him a choice to walk unassisted. To make writing more fun, implements like a squiggly pen, glitter pens or chalk were used. Adults decided to fade from 1:1 assistance to encourage peer interactions, and work with other students.

By November, the classroom teacher was very involved with Jose and he was responding to her. He was vocalizing more and peers referred to this as his talking. By mid November, the classroom teacher was redirecting Jose herself and those working with Jose seem to be pleased with his progress. Jose was still wandering around the room when the activity was not preferred, still having trouble with transitions and not following group directions very well. When the schedule changed, he became confused and this was reflected in his behavior.

December/January. December seemed to be a difficult month for Jose. He had several outbursts involving biting and scratching when upset (e.g., not allowed to do something or

when a toy was taken from him). He wandered around the room a lot, knocked things over when angry, tried to leave the room, hid under the teacher's desk, screamed and resisted efforts to help him learn. The teacher admitted being nervous about him when he was around other students. However, during this month he said his first word "push", when swinging at recess and seemed to understand that he must attempt and complete some work before going to recess. More demands were placed on him and on December 17 he stayed at his desk most of the time and interacted with classmates during the Christmas party.

Despite the Christmas break, Jose spent more time on task during January than December. The team had devised a system of reinforcement for him that required him to earn a certain number of stars for task completion before being allowed to go to recess. He appeared to be participating more in required activities and he seemed to understand the system. Though he became upset when he missed recess, he settled down immediately and worked to make up what he failed to do. When upset during class time, he was taken outside for a few minutes to calm down. He was cooperative working on writing (which was unusual), allowed himself to be redirected when needed, spent 110 minutes on task at one point and 105 minutes at another time. He was reported to be with the group more, though not responding to the other students. He was sitting with the group for story time and was walking with the class when they transitioned outside the classroom.

There were still some reported tantrums (screaming, kicking, crying), hiding under the desk and missing recess. However, when he stayed in from recess, he attended to his makeup work. The team determined that there were some inconsistencies existing between how the inclusion support teacher interacted with Jose as compared to the paraeducator. The

inclusion teacher was able to keep Jose on task for longer periods of time. The reward system appeared to be working for Jose and just needed to be explained in greater detail to the paraeducator along with overall goals for Jose. The plan for Jose involved keeping his focus on the other students so that he would learn to move with them. The classroom teacher reported being more involved with Jose's behavioral issues and in general seemed pleased with his progress.

February/March. During this month, there were frequent reports of Jose completing activities and staying on task more often. He was reported to stay on task with the paraeducator for 100 minutes. He appeared to do well at recess and the team felt it was time to fade the adult support. Jose demonstrated greater independence for going to the bathroom, throwing away his own trash and gathering needed materials. In addition transitions were smoother and the team determined that the special educational staff needed to fade to allow the classroom teacher to assume more authority over him. He was attending to story time and staying with the group at this time. His mother reported that she was working on comprehension of stories at home and perhaps this had helped at school.

Jose was still engaging in minor temper tantrums when toys bought from home were required to be left in his desk during class time, but he was settling down quickly and returning to work. He was able to leave toys brought from home in his desk, versus carrying them around with him.

At the onset of March, Jose frequently was off task (out of seat). However, during this month he showed improvement with greater cooperation, cutting and gluing independently during writing time, sequencing numbers, counting, interacting with other

children and adults, using a pictorial schedule for greater self-control, circling letters in reading, and verbalizing words (which his mother and grandmother also reported was happening at home). He was able to settle down quickly and return to work after being upset and was contributing appropriately in group discussions. He was still not earning recess at times and he still occasionally went outside for about five minutes to calm down before returning to work.

The team realized the need to make more adaptations for him to increase his participation in classroom activities. More peer interactions were deemed important and were to be encouraged. These recommendations were implemented. Transition plans for next year were initiated, but the principal seemed reluctant to name the next teacher.

April/May. Jose demonstrated considerable progress during the last two months of the school year. Reports of his behavior indicated that he was responding more to the classroom teacher, spent more time with the rest of the class and spent more time on task. Academic progress included identifying individual letters and numbers, matching letters, words and pictures, recognizing sight words, picture recognition, writing individual letters, tracing shapes and writing his name (using dots as guides). Interactions with peers improved (both in quantity and quality). Though he continued to exhibit some disruptive behavior such as screaming and temper tantrums, he seemed to be redirected with greater ease, could calm down more quickly and regain self-control. He also exhibited greater decision-making skills regarding his own behavior and other learning situations (e.g., deciding that he needed a certain material for a project). He seemed to understand consequences of his behavior (e.g. if work is not completed, recess is forfeited) and made decisions accordingly.

He seemed to demonstrate the most on task behavior when he was actively involved and had something specific to do (cutting, tracing, handling items), though he clearly disliked coloring. To compensate for this disliked activity, a color marker was used which he seemed to prefer. The activity that consistently caused him difficulty appeared to be sitting in a group and listening to the teacher (e.g., group instructions or listening to a story). For Jose to participate fully in large group time (e.g. choral reading of sight words and weekly big book), the team had decided that Jose would first benefit from some small group direct instruction in reading (in the classroom) before returning to the large group.

At the end of the school year, all members of Jose's team including his mother, held positive views of inclusion, felt that Jose had made some major changes and felt he should definitely remain at this home school. They all felt quite satisfied with the program and the progress made. A statement made by his mother during her interview in late May sums up Jose's year: "He's absorbing everything, watching the children. He's learning from them and I think it's great. He has learned so much this year."

Student 2. Santos

August/September. Pre-interviews with members of Santos' team revealed that only the inclusion support teacher and the principal held positive views of inclusion. All other team members (mother, paraeducator, classroom teacher and PE teacher) had more neutral views, seeing positive as well as negative aspects. Three members of his team (both teachers and paraeducator) felt he should attend his home school, while the principal had no idea where he should go to school and the PE teacher felt he shouldn't go to the school he was at

because more preparation was needed. Santos' mother felt he should go to a special classroom in another school.

At the beginning of the school year Santos was placed full time in a 1st grade English speaking classroom with a full time bilingual paraeducator for support. The first two months of school were difficult for Santos and were characterized by many tantrums which involved screaming, throwing objects, refusing to enter the building, and leaving the classroom. These behaviors were displayed when he was asked to transition from preferred activities such as playing at the water fountain and spinning objects to any type of academic task. In addition, Santos appeared afraid to enter the restroom and consequently he had toileting accidents.

Much time was spent outside of his first grade classroom due to Santos leaving the room or having to be taken out of the room because of the disruptions. During the time he was not in the room, he was on the playground, in the hall, or in a small room adjacent to the library. On September 7th, the paraeducator that started the year with Santos left her position due to her inability to deal with the situation. A new paraeducator who also spoke Spanish was hired.

By the end of September, Santos was spending more time in his classroom. Although the time he was physically in the classroom increased, he willingly engaged in only a few activities and few task demands were placed on him. He still left the classroom frequently, but a desk was placed in the hall outside the classroom to support his continued participation in the tasks he sought to avoid. The team decided not to allow Santos to leave the building during academic time, however, this resulted in more frequent tantrum and screaming

episodes. He began to use an alphabet board and facilitated communication to participate in phonics lessons (e.g. pointing to a requested letter). (This technique employs physical and emotional support to enhance communicative skills; see Biklen, Morton, Gold, Berrigan & Swaminathan, 1992). He was more comfortable in lining up and going to lunch with his first grade class, where previously he had gone in earlier than his classmates. Physical education class seemed to be the easiest area for Santos to participate. The teacher had prior experience working with children with disabilities and was able to establish a rapport with Santos.

During these months, weekly meetings were held. The team decided it was necessary to talk with general education students about Santos and make suggestions to help them interact with him. Also, the first grade teacher indicated that she was unsure about how to include Santos in the day to day lessons. Team members discussed various ways to provide more participation by adapting phonics pages, having Santos make more choices, and using the computer. To assist in solving the toileting issue, a strip of green electrical tape was placed on the floor as a visual cue and distracter. A positive shaping procedure was implemented, which resulted in success for Santos.

October/November. During the next months Santos' progress was slow. He developed severe ear infections which resulted in an increase of challenging behaviors (e.g., hitting, screaming, spitting, running out of classroom, crying). Fewer academic demands were placed on him during this time in an effort to decrease the screaming. Santos still worked often at a desk just outside his classroom.

Santos had been using facilitated communication to complete phonics and math work sheets, which had met with mixed results as he was inconsistent in his responses. He began

to transition to preferred activities (lunch and PE) by using his picture schedule with minimal prompting. Since Santos enjoyed cutting material with scissors, an adaptation that allowed him to complete assignments by cutting and gluing pictures was created.

Biweekly team meetings during this time frame focused on the need to provide Santos with a variety of activities to keep his interest and on brainstorming strategies to increase academic participation for each subject taught within the class. The team also agreed that Santos needed to develop more peer interactions with less interference from adults.

December/January. Santos interacted with his peers daily at recess by allowing them to push him on the swing and be near him in the sand. He began to participate in group activities more (e.g., reading of big books) and was sitting with the group for extended periods of time (20-30 minutes). He also transitioned with greater ease from preferred activities such as playing in water and sand to less preferred activities. During this time, his peers started to interact more with him. They encouraged him to line up after recess, sit during music and cued him in a variety of other activities. Santos also began to be more responsive to his classmates by looking at them when they were near or by following their direction or touch. Other teachers in the building (e.g. librarian and grade level teachers) commented positively about Santos' progress. The librarian specifically talked about a strategy she used that prevented Santos from knocking over a stack of books by allowing him to look through them. On January 3rd Santos sat with his peers during opening exercises for 35 minutes. He also lined up for PE with only one cue to look at what his peers were doing.

Though Santos made progress during these two months, he was still off task much of the time. Although leaving the classroom had decreased, screaming, hitting and spitting were

still behaviors that were problematic to interactions within the classroom. The first grade teacher interacted infrequently with Santos. Although this was discussed at team meetings, Santos continued to receive most instruction from the paraeducator. The team also discussed concerns about the lack of consistency and follow through when implementing teaching strategies and activities for Santos. Santos' second paraeducator left this position during January resulting in a paraeducator transferring from another student to this more difficult site. This paraeducator did not speak Spanish and a Spanish/English communication board was developed.

February/March. Santos began to attempt some vocalizations of sounds. To increase time on task, kitchen timers had been utilized as cues to begin work time and free time. Santos began to set his own timer and quickly became aware of the process. By the end of March, Santos had increased time on task to 15 minutes with five minutes of free time. Reading adaptations improved Santos' attending to the task if the adaptations involved manipulation of materials such as clothespins with letters for letter recognition, matching pictures to words or attaching pictures using glue (writing). Santos completed a part of a coloring activity independently and had initiated writing activities several times. He began to trace letters, thus enabling him to better participate in handwriting activities.

Though Santos increased his participation in academic areas during the past two months, there were still many reported tantrums (screaming, throwing objects). Interactions between Santos and the classroom teacher remained sparse and most interactions occurred between him and peers, the paraeducator, and the PE teacher. Despite the many curricular adaptations, Santos continued to have difficulty staying with a given task. Many problems

occurred when he wanted to engage in an activity of his preference (e.g. spinning objects or pouring objects from one cup to another) when he was expected to work. In an attempt to provide curricular adaptations which incorporated movement and sensory feedback, the team offered several options (a squiggle pen, rice or sand trays) that were later determined to be much too overwhelming for Santos, making it difficult for him to transition from the item.

Both the inclusion support teacher and the paraeducator noted that very little interaction with other adults in the school had been occurring. Several meetings were scheduled to discuss suggestions for increasing teacher and school ownership for Santos. Discussions occurred with the first grade teacher, principal and playground aides on different occasions with mixed results. The school personnel indicated their uneasiness about interacting with Santos, but agreed to make more attempts. Consistency in programming continued to be a concern, especially if Santos was experiencing a difficult day as characterized by excessive screaming and throwing objects in the classroom.

April/May. Santos began to give eye contact to his peers in a variety of activities and appeared to respond better to redirection from peers than from adults. During PE he started to watch the activity before he participated in it. More expectations were placed on Santos to participate in academic areas. Santos responded by demonstrating independent writing of letters within theme books when a dotted model of the letter was used. He began to match more pictures to words and worked up to 15 minutes at a time when the kitchen timer were used. Santos' performance continued to fluctuate during the week, and on occasion he would remain off task for much of the day. Santos' behavior seemed to change with each person supporting him, however, he continued to exhibit disruptive behavior characterized by

screaming, throwing objects and tantrums. The classroom teacher continued to have little interaction with him, and most instruction continued to come from the paraeducator. Toward the end of the school year the paraeducator voiced concerns about her ability to continue to adequately support Santos given the dynamics of this classroom setting. Team meetings were not held during this time period, but the support staff (paraeducators and inclusion support teacher) continued to meet on a weekly basis.

Despite obvious challenges throughout the year, three of Santos' team, including his mother expressed having positive views of inclusion at the end of the year. His paraeducator expressed a neutral view of inclusion stating that sometimes it was positive and sometimes negative. The paraeducator expressed her thoughts with these comments " Well it has been an interesting year. As I said we have had some really nice wonderful days and then we haven't. So it is a little bit of both". Only his classroom teacher and PE teacher expressed having negative views. Santos' mother, PE teacher and principal also reported being satisfied with the year. The PE teacher felt the year had gone exceptionally well, which seems in contradiction to his negative view of inclusion. The other half of the team (teachers and paraeducator) were not satisfied with the program. Only two members of his team (the inclusion support teacher and the PE teacher) felt he should continue to attend his home school, though the principal did think he should be in a general education classroom with support. Neither the paraeducator nor the classroom teacher would say where they felt he should attend school and his mother still expressed her desire for her son to attend a special self-contained program (with opportunities for integration).

Student 3. Troy

August/September. During the initial interviews with Troy's team members, three people (his mother, the inclusion support teacher and the PE teacher) expressed having positive views of inclusion. The principal and paraeducator felt more neutral toward the issue and the classroom teacher had a negative viewpoint. Four team members felt he should attend his home school. His classroom teacher was unsure and his PE teacher felt he should attend whatever school he wanted.

As the school year began, the staff reviewed the second grade classroom activities to determine where adaptations to facilitate Troy's inclusion should occur. As an adaptation to a classroom activity, Troy either typed the newsletter on the computer while his classmates wrote it, or he sequenced sentence strips and words. Poems and rhymes for daily messages/singing were put on tape for Troy to practice at home. The staff observed that Troy needed some wait time and decided to give Troy 5-10 seconds to follow through on tasks. Staff encouraged Troy to focus on directions directly from the classroom teacher rather than from the support staff.

Troy began the month working on getting from the bus to playground independently and ended the month working on walking to school. Academically, the team decided to reduce Troy's number of spelling words while also fading picture cues. At the same time it was decided to look for more writing opportunities throughout the day. Troy did well with the classroom routine and following his schedule, however, the staff decided to wait for Troy to initiate moving to the next activity by directing him to the natural actions of the other students. At this time, Troy was not engaging in many meaningful interactions with peers. It

appeared that he didn't know how to initiate conversations with peers or to sustain them once started. Troy's level of participation improved during September and positive changes were seen in opening music, staying with the class and listening to storytime.

The team decided to conduct a functional behavioral assessment and determined that when Troy was unsure of what to do he would more likely engage in inappropriate behavior. At this time the classroom teacher tended to stay away from Troy, leaving the paraeducator to assume primary responsibility for implementing Troy's program. In September, the classroom teacher recommended that Troy be pulled out of the class for at least 30 minutes a day for special needs, but the team tabled the idea.

October/November. Troy had a difficult time in a school assembly (characterized by hitting staff, rolling on the floor, soiling pants) and the team decided to make sure he was prepared for future large group activities and to allow him the choice of going or not. Troy often refused to do work, which typically occurred during nonpreferred activities, such as PE. Also, since Troy had problems such as rolling around on the floor and wetting his pants when using the outside school restroom, staff decided to use the inside classroom restroom so they could continue to work on independent toileting skills while allowing him privacy.

In weekly meetings, the team discussed more suggestions for adapting materials and strategies for instruction. For example, Troy fluctuated between typing four words to typing two sentences of the morning message on the computer. The classroom teacher mentioned she would like him to try to write more and the occupational therapist provided some

suggestions. Staff decided that rather than typing on the computer each day, they would make sentence strips to sequence and use this opportunity to work on facilitated handwriting.

At this point in the year, Troy sat in the back row, the seat closest to the door because the teacher felt that this was best in case he started screaming, he could be removed easily from the room. Troy liked to sit in the class rocking chair for some group activities like storytime. However, staff felt this was negatively affecting his participation level and decided to remove the chair. Sitting in the middle of the group for morning message increased his participation and attention. Troy also did well when asked by the teacher to sit up front and help hold the book while she rubbed his shoulders. Troy used facilitated handwriting during the day, and Troy consistently chose to it over typing. He also enjoyed reading his teacher's comments on his work.

December/January. At the beginning of December Troy was experiencing some difficulty (e.g., screaming during his walk). By the end of the month he was doing well and staff started discussing fading adult support and using peers to assist. More expectations were placed on Troy for curricular participation in the comprehension of stories read in class. Troy continued to show progress using the facilitated communication technique for handwriting. Transitions still caused some problems, but started to improve later in the month.

Socially Troy interacted only with a few peers, with an adult as a facilitator. Therefore, the team decided to fade adult support during cafeteria time and transitions to the playground. School psychologist told staff that Troy was not supervised enough requiring the inclusion support teacher to explain the goal of fading support. Classroom teacher agreed

with the inclusion support teacher and discussed this issue with the psychologist. To facilitate more interaction with peers, Circle of Friends (Forest & Lusthaus, 1989) was started with five friends. Classmates tried to get Troy to come in after recess, but he was often distracted by activities in the neighborhood (garbage truck) and required adult support. Troy seemed to be more interested in making classmates laugh (e.g. removing his shirt) than in other types of interaction. To help Troy reduce these inappropriate behaviors, the room was rearranged so he was closer to appropriate role models. Troy chose to participate and did well in the monthly Spirit Day (a large group activity that before would have caused problems).

In January, motivation during facilitated handwriting seemed to vary by the day. Time on task during math continued to improve and Troy continued to participate without special education support in music. As Troy was still having difficulty lining up with the class after recess, the paraeducator started to wait for him inside. A new behavior program was initiated that involved tickets; Troy was able to choose something he wanted to work for and was given five tickets. Tickets were lost for screaming in class, excessive laughing, or rolling on the ground. If he had one ticket at the end of the morning, he got his reward (an activity chosen from a menu, but often independent computer time). The ticket system seemed to assist in keeping Troy attentive. However, Troy seemed to have more problems with soiling his pants this month than usual. The classroom teacher appeared to be more comfortable with Troy and was very stern with Troy to get him to calm down.

Team meetings, which had been put on hold for three months, started up again. The team met for an hour to discuss "Circle of Friends", rotation of paraeducators, new ticket behavior plan, transition to third grade, and how to remove paraeducator support during

recess time. The classroom teacher felt that Troy should be retained next year and if so, she would like him to be in her class. The teacher was unhappy about losing the current paraeducator (who was scheduled to support another student), and thought it would be bad for Troy. The team decided to begin the process of looking for a new teacher for next year.

February/March. In February, Troy displayed extremely inconsistent levels of performance. At times Troy joined in the large groups, listened and performed well. Other days he seemed unable to participate due to distractions. Troy had a few exceptionally difficult days (hitting and screaming, soiling his pants and playing in the bathroom). However, during recess he played with other children and began to join in activities. Again, Troy chose to attend the month's Spirit Day activities, and though he did fine, he remained at a distance. During February, circumstances occurred in which the paraeducator moved to another school. The classroom teacher was involved with the interview and hiring process for the new paraeducator, and later stated that the new paraeducator was working well.

A goal of Circle of Friends was to have Troy use the telephone, with peers calling him in the evening. Mom reported that after one phone call, Troy said that the boy was his best friend. She was very pleased with this statement. Most of Troy's days appeared to be positive in March with a lot less screaming and behavior problems, and a lot more participation in a variety of academic activities. Coming in and sitting down after transitions appeared to greatly improve this month. Spelling also improved and reading went exceptionally well (e.g., he started reading books at the primer level). He received a good note from the librarian for following the library routine. Toward the end of the month, Troy seemed to be participating in most activities and enjoyed working hard on his academics.

Troy was given a choice to participate in a school wide field day (a large group activity). He chose to participate and ran four laps. This was a big step as in the past Troy has not participated and PE was his least preferred activity. This month, a positive token plan was initiated for the whole class and staff started to reduce the number of tickets for Troy's other system. The staff discussed designing more academic activities that Troy could do independently. After a discussion with the principal, it was decided that the inclusion support teacher would speak directly to the teachers and begin observations in third grade classrooms for next year placement for Troy.

April/May. During April, Troy continued to do more academic activities, such as reading patterned word books, identifying colors in Spanish, writing sentences, spelling, and working on subtraction and fraction problems. PE continued to be a difficult period for Troy, with lots of hesitation before participation. Troy was able to sit for more and longer periods of time with the class for such activities as assemblies and movies. Transitions to new activities went much smoother and Troy appeared proud of himself during many activities. Troy had a few episodes of behavior problems, mostly directed at the paraeducator, but was able to bring them under control much quicker. With regard to the transition to third grade, a teacher was chosen for next year and Troy's mother came in to observe the teacher.

For one of the last assignments of the year, Troy had to write eight thoughts about what he was proud of this year. After he wrote them, he volunteered to read it to the class and read the entire page independently. His responses were, "I learned to write. I walk to school. I don't hit, bite or scratch. I'm proud of the classroom teacher. I'm proud of Wood

School. I'm proud of my Mom. I'm proud of me." The whole class stopped and listened, then clapped and cheered when he finished.

Attitudes of team members changed minimally following this year of inclusion. Four team members felt positive about inclusion, including the paraeducator who was more neutral at the start of the year. The principal maintained his neutral view and the classroom teacher still felt negative, even though she said she would like to have Troy again as a student for the following year and felt very satisfied with the program. All of Troy's team felt satisfied or very satisfied with the year, except for the PE teacher who reported feeling dissatisfied due to Troy's lack of participation in his class. All team members felt he should continue in a general education classroom (four specifically stating his home school) and the classroom teacher added that a general education classroom would only be advisable with a paraeducator.

Adult Reactions

The interview data revealed that the majority of participants were positive in their view of inclusion, changing from nine positive views in August to 12 in May (see Table 1 for adult reactions). At the beginning of the project more participants stated being neutral toward inclusion (7 of 17), which was reduced to two people in May. These respondents who could see both positive and negative aspects of inclusion were either positively or negatively influenced from their experience with this project. Only one person reported being negative toward inclusion at the beginning of the study, and at the end of the first year three people reported having a negative view. However, it was not always clear what prompted a change

from a neutral to negative viewpoint. For example, Santos' PE teacher reported such a change in attitude, yet felt the year had gone exceptionally well:

"I really liked having Santos in class, a very interesting child- Very interesting to see the development. A neat kid- has an interesting warm way to receive me. I had a good experience with Santos. I've benefited greatly from my interactions with Santos".

At the beginning of the study, all but two of the 17 participants stated that a full-time support person would be needed to make inclusion successful. After one year everyone felt this level of support was essential. Also, before the study began, 8 of 17 participants felt that one benefit of the project would be that nondisabled students would learn about and learn to appreciate differences, and to be sensitive to those who are different. In May the number of respondents stating this benefit increased to 14, making it the most frequently mentioned benefit. This feeling was summed up nicely by Troy's mother when she stated: "I think it teaches the other kids that he really isn't so different. He is a person and he does think; and in the future if we are still here they will know him when he goes job searching. I think it teaches them compassion and how to react around people with disabilities, not to ignore them and think they are from a different planet."

All other responses were individually stated for each student. In general the mothers hoped their child would acquired specific skills (e.g., to speak) and be accepted as part of the group. By May half of the respondents per student stated that the student had made friends, and the majority of respondents for two students (Troy and Jose) felt that these students had acquired a lot of new skills. Pre-interviews showed that professionals expressed concern that students would cause disruptions, hurt themselves or others and had doubts that they would

be able to be successful. Concern regarding disruptions and continued inappropriate behavior also were apparent at the end of the school year, especially for Santos. However, Santos' first grade teacher who did not have a positive view of the inclusion effort stated that "The more he is in the classroom, the less the classroom even notice it as a distraction."

Having a supportive teacher who wanted the student in the classroom was mentioned by all mothers and the inclusion support teacher for all three students as well as the paraeducator for Santos. Associated with this attitude of wanting the child in the classroom was the perceived need to share ownership of the child. This sense of ownership is indicated in remarks made by Jose's kindergarten teacher: "It has helped me a lot to include him and to realize that he is a part of our classroom. I try to look at him and to realize that he is a part of our classroom. I try to look at him as just one of our class members. . I'm really going to miss him (next year). I'm going to keep my eye out for him and wonder when he sees me how he'll treat me." Such ownership was also seen for Troy when his second grade teacher remarked: "I'm trying to establish being able to tell him what to do, being able to have him follow directions, being able to reprimand him. I'm trying to take some of that away from the aide because I think it would be really nice if Troy could develop a relationship with the teacher... I think I just want the aide here in case of an emergency." A similar sense of ownership was not in evidence for Santos according to the following remarks from his first grade teacher: "They've pretty much taken care of everything, all his needs and everything, so it's been really good... I was worried about his behavior and how I was going to handle it and it ended up to where it was almost totally taken out of my hands." This lack of involvement was highlighted in a concern expressed in May by the inclusion

support teacher: "Santos is someone I haven't really been able to fade paraprofessional support from. The teacher has not developed a relationship with this student, so it is pretty much a special education student in a regular classroom setting. There are two programs running in one classroom and it has been a really hard year for Santos and for us." This aspect of teacher involvement was verified by the structured observations that indicated that Jose's and Troy's teachers spent 80% to 85% respectively, of the times observed directly interacting with these two students. For Santos, observations revealed that his teacher only directly inteacted with him 23% of the times observed.

The need to work together as a team to support each of these students was strongly desired by the inclusion support teacher in hopes of building a sense of shared ownership. However, in her efforts not to place extra "burden" on the teachers, she reported assuming much of the responsibility for the students' programs, which she felt could have hindered others' involvement. Though a true sense of team effort and collaboration emerged for Jose, this was less the case for Troy and even more of a problem for Santos. In Troy's case, his mother, PE teacher, and to some degree, his classroom teacher experienced feelings of being left out. For Santos, his classroom teacher and PE teacher expressed their lack of involvement (though the PE teacher wanted to be involved). Parental involvement also was much less apparent for Santos, perhaps due to her inability to speak English and her expressed unfamiliarity in general with the educational system.

Discussion

This qualitative investigation sought to examine the process of including three elementary students with autis..., intellectual impairments and behavioral challenges in their

age-appropriate typical classrooms and home schools. This study also examined the impact of this educational arrangement on the student, classmates without disabilities, teachers, paraeducators and other school members. Findings describe a process requiring ongoing modifications and adjustments to meet individual needs and expectations. Outcomes were different per student based on their individual needs and situations, yet all three students demonstrated considerable progress in the areas of social interactions with peers, increased self-control and ability to follow class rules and directions as well as academic skills development. The benefits for these three students were obvious.

Though each student demonstrated improvements in behavioral skills, socialization and academic skills, all three students were still requiring considerable support to do so. In addition the students were not performing on grade level, were still having difficulty making friends and socially interacting and were still struggling to control their inappropriate behavior. Statements made by the inclusion support teacher stressed the crisis nature of the first one to two months for all three students and established that time period as critical for developing trust among all key players. Her efforts to assume sole ownership for each student to "protect" the classroom teachers from any difficulties may have interfered initially with the development of more team ownership.

Though the students were the target of the study and demonstrated changes in their performance, the adults in this study obviously were impacted. Two of the boys' classroom teachers became considerably more involved with the student in their class, assuming greater ownership of the student and concern for the student's transition to the next grade. Santos' teacher, on the other hand seemed unable to assume this same level of involvement, which

could have been a major factor in his difficult adjustment to his class. This student also exhibited the most disruptive behavior, had spent his first year in school as the only child in a classroom where few expectations were placed on him, and came from a monolingual (Spanish-speaking) home. Obviously these factors could have accounted for his teacher's reluctance to assume even a modicum of ownership.

Other adults were impacted as well. Two paraeducators resigned during the year (both supported Santos) and the paraeducator that finished the school year with him expressed her desire not to continue in the position. On a more positive note, adults commented on the progress they observed with regard to social and academic achievement, as well as on benefits to others. The majority of respondents felt that the student with severe disability educated others about differences and taught appreciation and acceptance. Finally, two of the boys' parents and other family members expressed their satisfaction with their child's progress.

This type of descriptive inquiry provided rich information about the impact of inclusive education practices on three students with severe autism. Findings from this study emphasize the trial and error aspect of including students with severe disabilities full time in typical classrooms and describe some of the highly individualized strategies needed to make it successful. The ongoing teaming formed the basis for all individual decisions made regarding curricular adaptations, specialized materials and strategies to support positive behaviors. However, any interpretation of these findings to other situations should be made with caution given the small number of students, their unique characteristics, and the unique nature of the one district under study. Though data was obtained via a number of sources

(interviews, observations, logs) to attain a certain level of verifiability, classmates of these students were not interviewed, nor were their parents. This information could have shed a more direct light on the impact of the program on other students. Furthermore, this study provided no means of comparing the students' inclusive education program to a self-contained program.

Echoing findings from other studies on inclusion (Giangreco, et al., 1993, Janney, Snell, Beers & Raynes, 1995), an important component concerned the attitudes of key players. Yet in this study reported attitudes concerning inclusion in general did not always reflect specific feelings about the actual experience. Some key players (e.g., Troy's classroom teacher and Santos' PE teacher) expressed negative feelings regarding inclusion, yet appeared to like the student with the severe disability and expressed a desire to continue to interact with him. On the other hand those that held a positive view of inclusion throughout the year, did so despite obvious difficulties with the students' continued inappropriate behavior. It was the district's original commitment to inclusive education for its students with severe disabilities that provided the intensive and needed resources per student. Without such support the progress made, reported benefits for nondisabled students and level of key players' satisfaction with the year would be in question. This study emphasizes the need for intensive support for certain students to receive education in typical classrooms. However, the commitment to provide such support may have as much to do with certain preexisting beliefs of inclusion on the part of the staff as it does with the characteristics of the individual students.

References

Biklen, D., Morton, M. W., Gold, D., Berrian, C., & Swaminathan, S. (1992). Facilitated communication: Implications for individuals with autism. Topics in Language Disorders, 12(4), 1-28.

Denzin, N.K. (1978). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. N.Y.: McGraw Hill.

Downing, J., Eichinger, J., & Jacqueline, L. (in preparation). Inclusive education for students with severe disabilities: comparative views of principals and educators at different levels of implementation.

Forest, M. & Lusthaus, E. (1989). Promoting educational equality for all students: Circles and Maps. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & M. Forest (Eds.), Educating all students in the mainstream of education (pp. 43-57). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Giangreco, M.F. Cloninger, C.J. & Iverson, V.S. (1993). Choosing options and accommodations for children: A guide to planning inclusive education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Giangreco, M. F., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, R. & Schattman, R. (1993). "I've counted Jon": Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. Exceptional Children, 59, 359-371.

Giangreco, M. F., Edelman, S., Cloninger, C. & Dennis, R. (1992). My child has a classmate with severe disabilities: What parents of nondisabled children think about full inclusion. Developmental Disabilities Bulletin, 20(2), 1-12.

Hamre-Nietupski, S., McDonald, J., & Nietupski, J. (1992). Integrating elementary students with multiple disabilities into supported regular classes: Challenges and solutions. Teaching Exceptional Children, 24(3), 6-9.

Janney, R. E. & Meyer, L. H. (1990). A consultation model to support integrated educational services for students with severe disabilities and challenging behaviors. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15, 186-199.

Janney, R. E. & Snell, M. E., Beers, M. K. & Raynes, M. (1995). Integrating students with moderate and severe disabilities into general education classes. Exceptional Children, 61, 425-439.

Kennedy, C. & Itkonen, T. (1994). Some effects of regular class participation on the social contacts and social networks of high school students with severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 19, 1-10.

Lanquetot, R. (1989). The effectiveness of peer modeling with autistic children. Journal of the Multihandicapped Person, 2(1), 25-34.

Lord, C. & Hopkins, J. M. (1986). The social behavior of autistic children with younger and same-age nonhandicapped peers. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 16(3), 249-262.

McGee, G., Paradis, T. & Feldman, R. (1993). Free effects of integration on levels of autistic behavior. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 13, 57-67.

Meyer, L. H. & Evans, I. M. (1986). Modification of excess behavior: An adaptive and functional approach for educational and community contexts. In R. H. Horner, L. H.

Meyer & H. D. Fredericks (Eds.), Education of learners with severe handicaps: Exemplary service strategies (pp. 315-350). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Odom, S. L. & Strain, P. S. (1986). Comparison of peer-initiation to teacher-antecedent interactions for promoting reciprocal social interaction of autistic preschoolers. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 19, 59-71.

Peck, C. A. (1985). Increasing opportunities for social control by children with autism and severe handicaps: Effects on student behavior and perceived classroom climate. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 10, 183-193.

Peck, C. A., Donaldson, J. & Pezzoli, M. (1990). Some benefits nonhandicapped adolescents perceive for themselves from their social relationships with peers who have severe handicaps. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 15, 241-249.

Ryndak, D. L., Downing, J. E., Jacqueline, L. R. & Morrison, A. P. (in press). Parents' perceptions after inclusion of their child with moderate or severe disabilities in general education settings. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

Salisbury, C. L., Palombaro, M. M. & Hollowood, T. M. (1993). On the nature and change of an inclusive elementary school. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 18, 75-84.

Simpson, R. & Zionts, P. (1992). Autism: Information and resources for parents, families and professionals. Austin, TX: Pro-ed.

Stainback, S. & Stainback, W. (1992). Curriculum considerations in inclusive classrooms: Facilitating learning for all students. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Staub, D. & Hunt, P. (1993). The effects of social interaction training on high school peer tutors on schoolmates with severe disabilities. Exceptional Children, 60, 41-57.

Vacc, N. N. & Cannon, S. J. (1991). Cross-age tutoring in mathematics: Sixth graders helping students who are moderately handicapped. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 26, 89-97.

Wolf-Schein, E. G. (1994). Treatment of the autistic-spectrum disorder: Where are we now. Developmental Disabilities Bulletin, 22(1), 35-53.

Woods, T. (1982). Reducing severe aggressive and self-injurious behavior: A nonintrusive, home based approach. Behavioral Disorders, 7(3), 180-188.

York, J., Vandercook, T., Macdonald, C., Heise-Neff, C. & Caughey, E. (1992). Feedback about integrating middle-school students with severe disabilities in general education classes. Exceptional Children, 58, 244-258.

Table 1

Pre/Post Attitudes Toward Inclusion and Satisfaction Level With Inclusive School Year.

		Pre-Attitude	Post-attitude	Satisfaction level
Jose	Mother	Neutral	Positive	Very Satisfied
	Principal	Positive	Positive	Pleased
	Paraeducator	Positive	Positive	Real Pleased
	Inclusion Support Teacher	Positive	Positive	Very Satisfied
	General Education Teacher	Positive	Positive	Real Satisfied
Santos	Mother	Neutral	Positive	Satisfied
	Principal	Positive	Positive	Worked Pretty Well
	Paraeducator	Neutral to Positive	Neutral	Tough Year
	Inclusion Support Teacher	Positive	Positive	Not Satisfied
	General Education Teacher	Neutral	Negative	Very Difficult
	PE Teacher	Neutral	Negative	Exceptionally Well

		Pre-Attitude	Post-attitude	Satisfaction level
Troy	Mother	Positive	Positive	Satisfied
	Principal	Neutral	Both	Worked Very Well
	Paraeducator	Neutral	Positive	Really Satisfied
	Inclusion Support Teacher	Positive	Positive	Very Satisfied
	General Education Teacher	Negative	Negative	Excellent
	PE Teacher	Positive	Positive	Not Satisfied

Appendix A

Interview Questions

Full Inclusion: full time in regular education (same age), no pull out or minimal pull-out (one hour or less per day), actively involved in learning with other children to meet individual needs (not necessarily grade level academics), treated like an equal member of the class.

1. Why is inclusion happening now for _(child's name)_?

2. What, if any, information, have you heard regarding mainstreaming, integration or full inclusion for a student with autism or other severe disabilities?

3. Has this information left you positive,negative or neutral view of inclusion

4. How satisfied have you been with the past educational program for _____?

*5. In order for you to feel comfortable about having _____as a full-time member of your ___ class, what kinds of support do you feel are necessary?

6. Ideally, if you had your choice, where would you like to see _____ attend school?

*7. What are or were your concerns regarding _____ coming to (name of school) and being in your class?

8. Who helped to determine what _____educational needs are for the IEP and therefore, what his program would be?

9. Was anyone not included who you think should have been?

10. Thinking of the way in which most classrooms are run, what do you think works fine with _____ and were there some adaptations made so that he could be successful?

11. What were your hopes for _____ during this school year in terms of what you hoped he'd accomplish? Were they reached?

12. Based on the hopes you have for _____ what do you think an ideal program looks like?

13. Were there other benefits (either for ____ or others) of having him in this classroom?

14. Who are _____ friends?

15. What are your hopes/fears for the coming school years?

16. Is there anything else you would like to add to any of the others?

* Wording of questions was slightly modified depending on the role of the interviewee.

Appendix B

Observation Form

Observer Name_____Date _____

Student Name _____Grade_____

Location _____ Time _____

Subject/Activity _____

What is happening with general education children?(Size of groups...)

How is classroom teacher interacting with them (teaching style)?

What is target child doing? (what & with whom)

How is classrooom teacher interacting with target child?

Teacher/staff perceptions of what is happening? (Observer's thoughts)